Approved For Release 2005/11/23: CIA-RDP80M01133A000400190040-4 75-2905

THE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE Connettee 30

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20505 Class Ref: Conn. 8, 10 V

21 AUG 1975 Satelle 1572

Intelligence Community Staff

MEMORANDUM FOR THE UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE BOARD

SUBJECT: USIB Committee Responsibilities for Analysis of Foreign Weapon Systems

- 1. For the past several months, the Intelligence Community Staff has been investigating the various options open in determining how best to handle the problem of analysis of foreign weapon systems within the USIB committee structure. The problem arises primarily from two factors:
 - Dissatisfaction with the division of responsibility between SIC and GMAIC for the analysis of weapon systems-related information.
 - The desire of SIC to be relieved of the responsibility for covering current weapon systems to permit a better focus on advanced technologies and new physical discoveries and their possible application to future weapon systems.
- After considering a number of options and after a great deal of consultation with interested parties, the DCI has tentatively agreed to the following proposal:
 - Form one committee, to be called the Weapon and Space Systems Intelligence Committee (WSSIC), to study all aspects of foreign weapon and space systems.
 - b. Establish several sub-committees or working groups to carry out detailed analysis by technical discipline. For example, all ballistic missiles, whether tactical or strategic, would be handled by a single working group, all aircraft by a single working group, etc.
 - The chairman would be allowed to establish ad hoc working groups from time to time to handle any special matters which do not lend themselves to analysis by one of the extant working groups.

25X1

SEUREI

Approved For Release 2005/11/23: CIA-RDP80M01133A000400190010-4

- d. Sub-committee and working group chairmen would be drawn from appropriate elements of the Intelligence Community as agreed between the chairman and vice-chairman of the committee.
- e. In order to provide for an orderly transition from the present to the new working arrangements, the initial chairman would be the present chairman of the GMAIC, who would serve a minimum of one year, with a nominee of the Director, DIA, serving as vice-chairman.
- f. Thereafter, the chairman would normally serve a three-year term, with the chairman and vice-chairman positions rotating between CIA and DIA nominees.
- g. Designation of the chairman and vice-chairman of the committee would be made by the DCI in accordance with the provisions of DCID No. 1/3: Committees of the United States Intelligence Board (effective 3 Dec, 1974), and paragraph 2f above.
- 3. Any proposed solution to this longstanding problem must involve elements of compromise. The arrangement set forth above would go far toward solving the substantive problems which have existed because of the split responsibilities between SIC and GMAIC. It would facilitate the setting of priorities for study and would provide better assurance of overall coverage (without unnecessary redundancy) than does the existing arrangement. And it recognizes that interagency relationships are an important element of any system for committee handling of weapon system analysis.
- 4. The DCI desires to discuss the proposal outlined above at a USIB meeting at an early date. Following the Board's discussion, it is anticipated that the necessary changes in the applicable DCIDs will be developed for USIB consideration.

/s/ Samuel V. Wilson

Samuel V. Wilson
Lieutenant General, USA
Deputy to the DCI for the
Intelligence Community

D	i	S	t	r	i	b	u	t	i	0	n	:

Original - Addressee

1 - D/DCI/IC

1 - C/PRD (PRD Chrono)

1 - PRD/OC

√ - IC Registry

IC/PRD/TB:[

(Approved For)Release 2005/11/23 : CIA-RDP80M01133A000400190010-4

Talking Points for General Wilson Re USIB Committee Handling of Foreign Weapon Systems

- In trying to arrive at a proposal for the DCI on this matter, my staff and I:
 - -- Consulted with the various offices and agencies who had equities in the problem.
 - -- Laid out the various directions that we could go in trying to solve the problem.
 - -- Finally came up with the proposal now before you.
- 2. In drawing up this proposal we:
 - -- Recognized that the span of control of the Chairman of the proposed WSSIC will be quite broad, therefore,
 - -- have proposed a vice-chairmanship to help handle the load.
 - -- Have recommended rotation of the chairman and vice-chairman positions between CIA and DIA, believing those positions should be filled by agencies most directly involved in day-to-day analysis of weapon systems.
 - -- Felt that by putting a DIA nominee in the committee's superstructure we would give DIA more direct and important role in management of committee matters dealing with weapon systems.

- -- Felt that by aligning substructure of committee along technical discipline lines, we could eliminate the redundancy that would almost surely arise if we were to align them according to mission or to split the responsibility between two committees as has been done in the past.
- 3. Other options we considered were:
 - -- Continue present division of responsibility between GMAIC and SIC. This caused the problem in the first place.
 - -- Continue both GMAIC and SIC in weapon system analysis but give a renamed GMAIC responsibility for strategic systems and SIC responsibility for others. Division of responsibility and working group redundancy would be problems.
 - -- Leave GMAIC as at present and form a new committee to handle weapon systems now the responsibility of SIC. Division of responsibility still a problem.
 - -- Set up a new committee to handle tactical systems with a renamed GMAIC handling strategic systems. Responsibilities still split. Redundancy in analysis and working groups. Confusion as to which committee would handle new systems whose mission not yet determined.
 - -- Form a single committee with two major sub committees, one to handle tactical systems, the other to handle strategic systems. Foresaw the same gray areas that would exist between two separate committees and could not figure out what the role of the committee itself would be.
- 4. In going down the different roads and weighing and balancing all the good and bad aspects of the options I have just described, we decided that the proposal now before you has advantages that far outweigh any disadvantages that we could come up with.

<u>pr</u>	O SENICIEM WHOLESHE			1933AV00400
	UNCLASSIFIED	CONFID	ENTIAL	SECRET
	OFFIC	CIAL ROUTIN	NG SLIP	·
го	NAME AND	DATE	INITIALS	
1	C/IC/PRD/T	В	19 Aug	
2	DC/IC/PRD	17 600	Jin	
3	C/IC/PRD W	19/hug	flus	
4	EO/IC	8/19	M	
5	Λ⊁AD/DCI/IC		(2)30	KQ .
6	Obert		18/20	<u> </u>
	ACTION	DIRECT REPLY DISPATCH		MENDATION
	APPROVAL		RETUI	
	COMMENT	INFORMATION		TURE.
	CONCURRENCE	INFURMATION	Jaida	IIVKE
fo s:	is circ	a single com ystems. It no will po	nittee to a seeds Gen. Note that a transfer follows: on this su IB conside	analyze Wilson's mittal bject ration
	2 which by the	has been ten	tatively a	pproved subject
	on an a early d	genda for USI ate." (Conti	nued on Ba	
	on an a early d	genda for USI	nued on Ba	ck)
	on an a early d FOLD	genda for USI ate." (Conti	nued on Ba TO SENDER	

25X1

25X1

FORM NO. 237 Use previous editions

Approved For Release 2005/11/23: CIA-RDP80M01133A000400190010-4

- B. Also, enclosed is a "point" paper for Gen. Wilson's use in discussing the proposal at the USIB meeting.
- C. Finally, attached to the "point" paper is a copy of the memorandum to the DCI making the original proposal and his tentative approval of it.

25X1